

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 270 644

CE 044 620

**TITLE** Delivery of Education and Training in Oregon's Adult Corrections Institutions. An Analysis of Present and Future Directions.

**INSTITUTION** Northwest Regional Educational Lab., Portland, OR. Education and Work Program.

**SPONS AGENCY** Oregon State Dept. of Human Resources, Salem.

**PUB DATE** May 86

**NOTE** 61p.

**PUB TYPE** Reports - Research/Technical (143)

**EDRS PRICE** MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.

**DESCRIPTORS** \*Adult Vocational Education; Community Colleges; Contracts; \*Correctional Education; Cost Effectiveness; \*Delivery Systems; \*Educational Cooperation; Educational Research; \*Job Training; Postsecondary Education; \*Program Improvement; Vocational Rehabilitation

**IDENTIFIERS** \*Oregon

**ABSTRACT**

This report on education and training in Oregon corrections institutions begins with a brief discussion of trends in correctional education and funding patterns. It then examines three general models of corrections education service delivery: educational programming under institutional superintendents, statewide programming facilitated by a state director or coordinator of corrections education, and a statewide correctional education district structure. Strengths and weaknesses of each approach are cited. The report then addresses the pros and cons of contracting for education and training services with local education/training institutions. Some data are provided on relative costs. A number of basic principles that might be considered for program improvement are suggested. Five recommendations for short- and long-term action are made: identification of a purpose statement for education and training, funding of a position with responsibility for planning and monitoring consistent services across institutions, establishment of an interinstitutional curriculum committee, discussions on contracting education and training services to local community colleges, and drafting of legislation and implementation of policies/procedures for an Oregon corrections education district. Appendixes, amounting to approximately one-half of the report, include corrections education commission recommendations, a 1981 report on Oregon corrections, strategies for correctional vocational education, and characteristics of exemplary programs. (YLB)

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
\* from the original document. \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

ED270644

**DELIVERY OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING  
IN OREGON'S ADULT CORRECTIONS INSTITUTIONS**

**An Analysis of Present and Future Directions**

for

**Education/Training Task Force  
Corrections Division  
Department of Human Resources  
State of Oregon**

by

**Education and Work Program  
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory  
320 S.W. Sixth Avenue  
Portland, Oregon 97204**

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

May 1986

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS  
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY



TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE 044622

## CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Acknowledgements	7
Trends in Corrections Education	8
Models and Options	9
A.    Institution-Based Programs	10
B.    Statewide Coordination	11
C.    State Corrections Education District	13
Delivery System	15
A.    Contracted Programs	15
B.    Specialized Centers	17
Cost Implications	18
Guiding Principles, Alternatives and Recommendations	22
Appendices	
A.    Corrections Education Commission Recommendations	29
B.    Analysis of Employment-Related Education and Training in Oregon Corrections, 1981	36
C. <u>Colleges with Fences</u> Report, 1985	40
D.    Characteristics of Exemplary Corrections Education Programs, 1984	42
E.    Florida's Correction Education District Model	44
F.    Possible Position Description: Assistant Administrator/ Education and Training Programs, Oregon Corrections Division	49
G.    Interviews with Inmates, 1986	51
H.    Oregon Labor Market Projections	52
Bibliography	56

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Corrections Division shall:

(e) Provide persons who are motivated, capable and cooperative with opportunities for self-improvement and work.

ORS 423.020

It is the policy of the Corrections Division within the resources available to provide educational programs which are responsive to the assessed needs of incarcerated individuals in its custody...Criteria for selection and assignment to these programs shall be equitable and nondiscriminatory for all participants, based on the client's interest, aptitude, and career goals...Participation in educational programs is by mutual agreement between the inmate and appropriate institutional staff...

Corrections Division Rule #112

April 18, 1986

#### INTRODUCTION

Corrections education and training programs in Oregon may be one of the best-kept secrets in the state:

- o most inmates have access to a wide variety of learning resources available, designed to address most any need or long-range goal
- o staff tend to be dedicated and committed professionals who understand the unique needs of their students and the unusual nature of their instructional environment
- o students tend to appreciate the staff and program variety while admitting—"you get out what you put in"
- o programs are comparable to offerings in the public education system, and, in some cases, have a distinct luxury not available to regular postsecondary institutions: extended time to concentrate on specific learning outcomes
- o coursework offered through Chemeketa Community College, Blue Mountain Community College, and Western Oregon State College provides not only instructors who are experts in their subject area but the "passport" for advanced education and placement in fields where a two- or four-year degree is required

- o superintendents at the institutions demonstrate their cooperation and support for education and training despite continuing budgetary pressures and overcrowded conditions
- o education and training opportunities at the institutions attempt to be responsible to both inmates' interests/needs as well as external demands (e.g., changes in the labor market)
- o several vocational programs have strong, active advisory committees which provide valuable support in many ways--something rare to find in "outside" institutions
- o most key persons involved in education and training programs recognize that a job, a terminal diploma, or even "credits in the pocket" should not be the primary motive in allocating resources for corrections education. If inmates can experience success in these programs--particularly improvement in self-concept--then staff believe resources have been well spent. For many inmates, success in corrections education may be the first time they have ever had a positive experience with school or any community service
- o staff in education and training programs--particularly administrators--seem to take advantage of limited opportunities to improve their skills and participate in professional association activities
- o institutional staff and administrators in education and training seem eager to articulate with other institutions and agencies, such as
  - o other adult corrections institutions in the state
  - o the youth corrections system
  - o faculty in community colleges who might be interested in building a "continuous progress" competency-based curriculum
- o staff are given freedom to develop new courses or create new learning opportunities within budget parameters and contract
- o institutional staff are part of the corrections "family" and cannot view themselves only as teachers; security and extracurricular activities come with the assignment
- o there is a good working relationship between key staff in the institutions and the "serving" community colleges
- o there is a receptive climate in state government (e.g., legislature, other state agencies) to better serve the needs of inmates who seek education and training services; similarly, there is a heightened public awareness that prison overcrowding and increased numbers of ex-offenders "on the streets" means taxpayers should be prepared to provide increased resources for rehabilitation

On the other hand, there are some concerns the study team from Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory uncovered, not only in our data-gathering in Oregon, but through comparisons with systems that operate in other states:

- o education and training services in the institutions lack a clear statement of purpose or mission
- o Oregon corrections education has no "desk" at the Division level to coordinate planning, evaluate programs and staff, participate in national or regional activities that require official state representation, seek additional resources through public and private sources, arrange for curriculum articulation with other agencies, serve as a central contact point for contracts with program deliverers (community colleges, higher education), and, particularly, to serve as an advocate for strong, cost-effective education/training programs with a vision for the future
- o data from inmates indicate a need for more classes in such areas as survival (employability) skills, business, typing (keyboarding), computer technology, the arts (including graphic arts), leadership skills, short-term training, etc.
- o transition services to help inmates acquire employability and survival skills before release are not being addressed in any systematic fashion
- o some students expressed concern about rigid structure in classes, more care in matching student abilities to classes, long blocks of time in classes and equipment or instructors becoming outdated, while others felt more structure is needed and that time was too short
- o space, equipment and materials are insufficient for quality programming in some instances
- o education and training budgets seem to be easy targets when cuts have to be made at the institution level
- o it is difficult to know what effects education and training programs may have had on inmates since no follow-up data are maintained
- o education and training activities seem to be underrepresented when coordinating other institution activities and schedules, resulting in communication breakdowns
- o connections between prison industries and education/training are not evident beyond strong apprenticeship opportunities except at EOCI and BMCC where all inmates participate or attend/complete pre-employment seminars

### Earlier Oregon Studies

Other studies have been conducted on education and training programs in Oregon corrections prior to this brief 1986 analysis. In 1974, the Oregon Corrections Education Commission performed a comprehensive one-year study and made extensive recommendations. In 1977, a Joint Corrections Education Planning and Development Team gave a "progress report" on the Commission's recommendations and made additional suggestions of its own (Appendix A). The Team consisted of members from the Department of Education, Corrections Division, Employment Division, Portland State University, and Chemeketa Community College.

A brief summary of the 1974 Corrections Education Commission recommendations follows:

- (1) Funding of corrections education (CE) should be consistent with and in amounts comparable to the funding received by the state's community colleges.
- (2) Corrections education programs should be eligible for state and federal education grants available only to "certified education systems."
- (3) Education programs should be centrally coordinated.
- (4) Education programs should be structured and organized to allow for the rotation of instructional staff.
- (5) A centrally-coordinated advising, counseling, career planning and placement program should be established.
- (6) Planning and development of corrections education programs should be vested with the Oregon Department of Education, the State System of Higher Education, and the Corrections Division. Operation of correction programs should be vested with Corrections Division.
- (7) Adult Basic Education services should be provided through contract with the state's community colleges.
- (8) Vocational/para-professional education services should be provided through contracts.
- (9) Postsecondary academic services should be provided through a combination of contracted/volunteer instruction.

The Joint Corrections Education Planning and Development Team added these recommendations in 1977:

- (1) Systematic assessment of client needs, goals and objectives should be provided.
- (2) Additional counseling support should be available to address such areas as personal, social, vocational, educational and family concerns.



- (3) Information on resources available for successful transition to the community should be systemized.
- (4) Competency-based curriculum should be developed for better articulation with other education agencies.
- (5) Vocational training opportunities need to be opened to inmates at OWCC and second shifts need to be added at OSP and OSCI to alleviate waiting lists.
- (6) Additional facilities should be constructed to accommodate student demand.
- (7) Postsecondary coursework offered should serve as the foundation for associate and baccalaureate degrees.
- (8) Staff development should be emphasized, including substitutes for faculty when in training and a personal professional development plan prepared for each staff member.
- (9) Staff duties, job requirements and responsibilities need to be clearly delineated.
- (10) Use of volunteers--particularly for one-on-one tutoring--should be emphasized.
- (11) Evaluation and followup services should be available.

In 1981 the State of Oregon Executive Department prepared a report on employment-related education and training programs in Oregon. Brief mention of OSP and OSCI vocational programs is given with recommendations (see Appendix B).

#### Overview of 1986 Study

This report examines three general models of corrections education service delivery: 1) educational programming under institutional superintendents, 2) statewide coordinated programming, and 3) a correction education district structure based on interviews, review of the current literature, and analysis of innovative systems in the states of Virginia, Florida, and Washington.

The report also examines the pros and cons of contracting for education and training services with local education/training institutions. Some data are provided on relative costs.

A number of basic principles that might be considered for program improvement are suggested.

Finally, recommendations for short- and long-term action are narrowed to a total of five.



A national perspective on correction education delivery systems came through telephone interviews with Diane Carter, U.S. Department of Education; Osa Coffey, Institute for Economic and Policy Studies and past president for Correctional Education Association (CEA); Jack Littlefield, National Center for Research in Vocational Education. Valuable information was received from corrections educators in such states as Washington, Virginia and Florida.

Gayle Gassner (Chemeketa Community College) and Ellsworth Mayer (Blue Mountain Community College) conducted interviews with inmates in the Salem institutions and Pendleton (EOCI) respectively.

NWREL staff conducted interviews with teachers, coordinators and top administrators at each institution as well as the nearby community colleges. In addition, input was received from the state department of education and state department of employment, and the Oregon Occupational Information Coordinating Committee.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many individuals have contributed their time and expertise to the development of this report. NWREL wishes to thank Diane Carter, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C.; Jack Littlefield, National Center for Research in Vocational Education; Osa Coffey, Institute for Economic and Policy Studies, Virginia; Robert Clausen, Oregon Department of Education; and Don Egge, Oregon Department of Education.

Special thanks to Dave Carnahan, Washington State Department of Corrections; Thom Gehring, Virginia Department of Corrections Education; Gloria Ward, Florida Department of Corrections; and G.S. Joseph, Washington State Penitentiary, Walla Walla, Washington for all the telephone time and informative materials.

Appreciation is also extended to Gayle Gassner, Chemeketa Community College; Ellsworth Mayer, Blue Mountain Community College; and the fine administrators and staff at OSP, OSCI, EOCl, OWCC, and Chemeketa and Blue Mountain community colleges.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## TRENDS IN CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION

### The First 130 Years

According to Gehring, corrections education has its origins in the 1840s, when reformers thought offenders should learn to read the Bible and be "saved." Later, regular school teachers were hired to work at a few institutions. Between 1870-1900 the American Correctional Association was born and standards of excellence for CE were first introduced.

1933 brought the establishment of the first statewide CE bureau--the Division of Education in the New York Department of Corrections. The bureau concept replaced the traditional pattern of decentralized programming under each institutional superintendent.

In 1969, Texas established the first correctional school district. A correctional school district (CSD) is a statewide CE service delivery organization to which the state department of education assigns all rights and responsibilities of a local public school district.

In 1980, the U.S. Education Department identified corrections education as an "emerging priority," and implemented a Corrections Education Association (CEA) proposal to establish the first corrections program unit in the Office of Adult and Vocational Education. This program office now serves as a clearinghouse and point of contact for state-level CE directors across the country.

In 1982, the Corrections Education Association established a national headquarters in Washington, D.C., with an executive director and staff. In 1984 the CEA presented a list of characteristics found in exemplary CE delivery systems. These are noted in Appendix D.

### Funding Patterns

In the 1960s, Congress established several funding programs that can be utilized in corrections settings. The Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1963 was amended to make funds accessible to CE. The Neglected and Delinquent section of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I program was established in 1966, as was the Adult Education Act. (Title VI, being the part most often used for CE). In 1968, the Vocational Education Act was amended to provide services for disadvantaged offenders, and Law Enforcement Assistance Act discretionary funds were made available. In addition, funds were also made available through a number of other programs, including some from the Department of Labor (Gehring, 1984).

Corrections educators now are able to access the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act (1984) which includes a one percent setaside for offenders. Offenders are also eligible for services under the Education for All Handicapped Act, the Job Training and Partnership Act (JTPA) and Women's Education Equity Act. Grants from the National Institute of Corrections can also have an education/training focus.

## MODELS AND OPTIONS

NWREL's review of state CE options identified three typical state approaches to delivering education and vocational training services in adult corrections institutions nationally:

1. CE programming planned and administered by institutional superintendents
2. Statewide programming facilitated by a state director or coordinator of corrections education, and
3. Statewide corrections education district structure

Contracting with local education agencies (e.g., community colleges) or other providers (e.g., local university, proprietary schools) can occur under any model.

In general, the first model is what Oregon utilizes in 1986. The institution's education manager or vocational/academic supervisors recommend program and service delivery to the superintendent who oversees all education services. There is coordination within each institution of curriculum, equipment, evaluation of teachers and programs, but there is no consistency or coordination between each institution. Each institution operates independently. Contract services with outside education agencies are determined by each institution.

The second model—statewide coordinated programming—emphasizes coordination, cooperation and consistency. A central office staff person, preferably with an education administration background, works with education managers, academic and vocational supervisors, and institution superintendents to facilitate and monitor education services. States using this model mandate that funds allocated to education be disbursed only for educational purposes. Standards for programs are carefully monitored. Evaluation of education and training managers and staff may also be conducted by this office. Apparently Oregon has had division-level support for coordinating education and vocational/training in times past—an office that was cut when budget reductions were necessary.

The third model—creating a separate correction education district—seems to be the current trend in CE delivery systems. This approach creates a legal entity to operate educational programs in corrections institutions—either under its own jurisdiction or by contract. The advantage cited most frequently for this model is its ability to qualify for state and federal funding that comes to any local education agency. District "managers" can either be existing state employees or the agency can actually hire its own staff and operate almost as a separate entity (e.g., as does the prison industries program in Oregon today).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

#### A. Institution-Based Programs

This model leaves education and training planning, budgeting and operations in the hands of program managers closest to the students--the local institutional superintendent and unit supervisors. Budget decision-making is simply folded into the overall allocation for that institution and liaison with Division and external agencies is handled independently by each site following rules provided by the Division.

##### Strengths of this approach

1. The superintendent and staff at each institution know the unique factors that operate at that site: a particular clientele, a set of traditions, a permanent staff, a facility that has built-in advantages and disadvantages.
2. Programs that operate at a particular institution have a reputation to maintain. Inmates know and trust the staff and encounter a set of expectations built on years of experience.
3. Working relationships have been built up over the years and staff know what to expect.
4. Given budget parameters, staff can move quickly to create new courses and activities without having to ask for approval from "downtown."

##### Weaknesses of this model include:

1. Each institution creates its own education and training agenda unilaterally, with few inter-institutional similarities or standardization of content.
2. Each institution must try to access available resources from other agencies in a "hit and miss" manner.
3. A contracting agency must deal with separate staff in each institution in building a total package.
4. No one answers the phone at the Division level when someone asks for the Oregon Coordinator of Corrections Education. A recent national meeting of state directors, with expenses underwritten by the U.S. Department of Education, had no Oregon representation.
5. There is no one person to talk with who knows about innovative curriculum and instruction strategies for corrections. Evaluation of education and training personnel is performed by institution administrators who may have no training or experience in effective teaching and classroom management research.
6. There is no one place for a state legislator or Division staff person to obtain a comprehensive picture of education and training services, enrollment, costs, follow-up data, etc.
7. There is no central advisory body that can serve as an advocacy group for corrections education and training.

## B. Statewide Coordination

Under this approach, there is a state specialist or director who oversees CE services. This coordinator serves as advisor on educational programming and may have experience in classroom teaching as well as educational administration. This position may report to the chief administrator of the state department of corrections or state department of education, whatever is found most workable in a particular state.

The state level CE office works directly with other corrections departments, the parole board, administrators and local contracting agencies to develop, coordinate, and monitor education/training services.

This administrator represents corrections on various interagency committees and act as liaison with the state's community colleges, units within the department of education (such as special education), the U.S. Department of Education, the State Job Training Coordinating Council, department of employment placement specialists, apprenticeship programs, state vocational education advisory council, state literacy groups, and other educational and training providers.

Other activities may include assisting with the development of recreational, educational, and law library collections, monitoring library procedures, and making recommendations for improvement of these services.

Following other states' example, institutional industries is another area of possible involvement, assisting in the development of academic, vocational and apprenticeship programs. Under this model, the "net" of financial, informational, and human resources is larger, thanks to participation in regional and national meetings with coordinators in other states. A sample job description is provided in the appendix.

Strengths of this model:

1. Someone is identified as an administrator/resource person institutional superintendents can turn to for advice and assistance in planning and implementing programs.
2. This office can assist with course standardization so that competencies covered at one institution closely resemble competencies addressed at another institution.
3. Staff development opportunities can be arranged that meet the needs of faculty and aides at more than one site.
4. The state is represented at regional and national meetings which involve state-level corrections educators.
5. Articulation agreements can be worked out with local education agencies to assure a smooth transition for inmates wishing to continue a program elsewhere.
6. Program planning can be coordinated with other agencies in the state, particularly in regard to labor market trends and available curriculum that can be adapted from existing sources.

7. Contractors will have one central office to contact when it is time to prepare budgets and build working agreements or work out problems that may arise.
8. There is someone who takes the initiative to call meetings of instructors, supervisors, contract staff, etc., for general information-sharing.
9. Education and training has more visibility in the state system and advocacy for programs can more likely occur.
10. Certain minimum standards can be established and monitored. Quality of teaching can be monitored on a consistent basis.
11. It is possible that agencies such as the Department of Education would share the cost. It may even be wise to have this specialist housed in the Department.
12. The state department of education has expressed interest in exploring the idea.
13. Coordination of corrections education with the counties and with the Children's Services Division might also be included in this office.

Weaknesses of this model:

1. It is easy for local institution staff to feel that decisions are being taken away from the grassroots level.
2. There will be additional cost in re-establishing an administrative position for corrections education.
3. There is no assurance that an educator placed in this position would have a corrections perspective.



### C. State Corrections Education District (CED)

Thom Gehring, a Rehabilitative School Authority (RSA) planner in Richmond, Virginia has studied the CED extensively. The RSA where he is employed is a state agency that functions like a combined Youth/Adult correctional school district, and is organizationally independent of the Department of Corrections and Department of Education.

The RSA is one of several forms of the CED model. The first, Windham School District, began in Texas in 1969.

Eleven states have established corrections education districts as of early 1986. Services coordinated by these organizations typically include:

1. Adult basic education
2. GED/high school completion
3. Vocational education
4. English as a second language
5. Social education
6. Special education
7. Postsecondary education
8. Literacy Volunteers

Some services are contracted to community colleges or other approved educational agencies. Staff develop school calendars, and staff inservice programs, administer Federal funding through Vocational Education, Chapter I, and Adult Basic Education programs, and maintain liaisons with related agencies. Programs are evaluated periodically.

In Oregon, the legislature would need to create the authority for such a structure which could be housed under the Division of Corrections or Education, or a completely separate agency that functions like a district.

The board composition could be five-seven members serving as executory agent, supervised by the State Board of Corrections or Education. The superintendent could be employed by the State Department of Corrections or Education. The superintendent could report to the director of corrections, or education, or the board, and serve at their pleasure.

Other features might include the CED standing in the same relationship to the Department of Education as the community colleges throughout the state. The major difference, of course, is that Oregon community colleges rely to a major extent on a property tax base which requires local approval.

The creation of CEDs was in part a response to the substantial funding programs Congress established in the mid-1960s.

The American Correctional Association passed a resolution in 1976 recommending states consider establishing a correction education district to promote effective long-range planning and securing funds for basic education programs. The same idea appears in the 1974 and 1977 task force reports in Oregon (see Appendix). More details on how the State of Florida organized its CED is found in Appendix E.

**Strengths of this model:**

1. Corrections education and training becomes visible to policymakers.
2. An entity is established which is able to "compete" equally with other education/training providers for various federal, state and private funds.
3. A policy or advisory board provides valuable guidance and advocacy for the education and training needs of inmates.
4. It is possible that the district could become accredited in its own right, but would more likely continue to contract for education/training services with nearby community colleges.
5. There is precedence nationally for this model.
6. The political climate may be right for such an action.
7. Individual staff members in the state department of education expressed interest in exploring the issues.
8. Responsibility for education/training in community corrections and Hillcrest/MacLaren could conceivably be assigned to this district.

**Weaknesses of this model:**

1. Requires action by the Legislature.
2. Definitely places education and training responsibilities in the hands of an appointed group who would hopefully still work closely with local institution administrators and staff.
3. May lead to tighter control of what should be taught, how and by whom.

## DELIVERY SYSTEM

### A. Contracted Programs

Present delivery of education services in the state's four institutions is handled in various ways. At the Salem institutions, adult basic education/GED and vocational programs are coordinated and taught by Corrections personnel following a pattern that has been in effect for years. In more recent times, Chemeketa Community College has been delivering coursework that leads to associate of arts degrees as well as college transfer coursework. And, for vocational offerings at OSP and OSCI which are also available at Chemeketa and meet the same approval standards, CCC has been allowing the equivalent vocational coursework to count for college credit. At EDCI, not yet in full operation, the only educational services available are provided by Blue Mountain Community College and there are no immediate plans to hire institutional educators on the direct Division payroll. All concerned are pleased so far with the services offered by BMCC. No vocational training is yet available, though some tie-in with industries may be considered. Blue Mountain is open to the idea of providing vocational services as well.

NWREL's interviews uncovered a number of strengths for contracting education and/or training services with local community colleges:

1. Greater variety and flexibility of offerings is available, responding quickly to inmate interests and changes in the economic environment outside. Access to community college equipment that is transportable was considered a plus.
2. Contracting with an external agency brings in new ideas and energy. Institutional staff admit they, in time, can "burn out" working with the inmate population.
3. Instructors are less likely to be assigned to non-teaching tasks if they work for another agency.
4. Faculty have access to a broad spectrum of professional colleagues and staff development opportunities on the home campus and around the state/region.
5. Salaries/benefits in the community college setting may be more attractive.
6. It is easier to transfer inadequate staff if they are actually working for another organization.
7. Credits/diplomas from a community college or four-year institution look better on an offender's transcript than does a "credit" from the institution. Inmates also view the community college credit as more valid and valuable.

8. The community colleges generally already have in place the full spectrum of education, training and support services required in a comprehensive corrections education program, so why should there be a duplicate set inside the fence?
9. Program quality is already assured since community colleges have to meet rigorous accreditation standards if diplomas/degrees are to be acceptable.
10. Community college staff are generally highly qualified, yet do not have to meet teacher certification requirements set by the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission. If an English-as-a-Second-Language specialist is needed part time, assistance can be arranged.

Weaknesses of contracting with a local education agency must also be considered:

1. Faculty on the institution payroll have greater stability and understanding of inmate needs.
2. Institutional staff get better acquainted with inmates over the course of confinement; successful prisons depend on a stable staff.
3. Security is a constant concern of corrections staff and they are trained to deal with criminal behavior; contract teachers may not share these safety issues and may be too lenient at times.
4. Community colleges hire a lot of part-time staff in order to meet course loads; there is considerable turnover leading to potential security problems.
5. Contract teachers may not always know who to report to while there is no question for institutional staff.
6. In-house faculty may be more committed to the institution and be more willing to participate in other aspects of prison life (reporting bad conduct, participating in community projects, joining in all-staff social functions).
7. Institution staff feel more secure in their jobs since they are working in a state government system with tenure rights and other benefits.

(NWREL recognizes that some of these weaknesses do not apply "across the board" for both full time and contracted staff assigned by the community colleges to teach in institutions. It may be possible to stipulate in contracts that only persons willing to work in a corrections setting full time will be assigned.)

## B. Specialized Centers

One option NWREL believes should be explored would require a total restructuring of education and training services as well as major changes in how offenders are assigned to the various institutions.

This model would involve consolidating all vocational/technical programs, for example, at a single institution to concentrate specialized equipment and staff in one location, target those inmates who are serious about learning a particular trade and avoid program overlap and duplication.

Another institution might be designated as the location for all academic/college transfer programs for example. Each institution would likely still offer a range of adult basic/literacy/special interest coursework.

The obvious difficulty here is assignment of maximum and minimum security offenders and providing equal access to programs for both male and female offenders; the advantage is in staffing and equipment update as well as creating an atmosphere for inmates that "means business" when it comes to winning a slot and having the opportunity to enter a particular program. Or, certain programs might only be available at certain institutions.

## COST IMPLICATIONS

An important aspect of this study is a consideration of costs involved in providing academic and vocational training to inmates. One aspect of the cost study was a comparison of costs between in-house instruction by corrections staff compared with costs for contracting out this service to community colleges.

Average monthly instructional costs per inmate served were calculated for OSP and OSCI for in-house and for contracted services. Because vocational costs are usually higher than academic costs, we broke the costs out separately for each type of instruction.

Table 1 shows the average monthly inmate enrollments for the first three months of 1986 for academic and for vocational training. The figures are presented separately by institution for courses offered inhouse and those taught by contract through Chemeketa Community College (or Blue Mountain Community College for OSCI). Both unduplicated counts and class enrollments are used. Unduplicated counts refer to the number of individual inmates involved in one or more classes, while the class enrollments refer to the number of inmates per class and account for the fact that some inmates are taking more than one class. Across the four institutions, there are 362 inmates enrolled in inhouse academic training and 314 in vocational training. In addition, there are 398 inmates taking academic training through contracted services with community colleges.

Average monthly costs for instruction through in-house or contracted services are shown separately in Table 2. These costs are based on salary and fringe benefits of instructors and support staff.

Since vocational training is provided only by in-house instructors, no comparisons were made with contracted services. Table 3 shows the comparative average monthly cost per inmate at OSP and OSCI for in-house and contracted services for academic training. Instructional costs for OSP were higher than they were at OSCI. For both institutions, the contracted service costs were cheaper than in-house costs, due largely to the use of part-time staff this year at the community colleges. However, for next year both colleges indicated a desire to use more full time staff, which could increase the cost for contracted services and therefore limit the number of class offerings. While the average monthly cost per inmate at OSP for in-house academic training was \$214.52, the cost for vocational training was \$340.39. At OSCI, the average cost for academic training was \$150.28, while the average cost for vocational training was \$240.33.

TABLE 1  
INMATE ENROLLMENTS IN ACADEMIC AND VOCATIONAL TRAINING

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Training</u>	<u>Class Enrollments</u>	<u>Unduplicated Count</u>	<u>Class Enrollments</u>	<u>Unduplicated Count</u>
OSP	Academic	437	167	516	140
	Vocational	117	117		
OSCI	Academic	549	174	402	150
	Vocational	187	187		
OWCC	Academic	62	21	27**	8
	Vocational	10*	10		
EOCI	Academic			76	68
	Vocational				

\* Two OWCC inmates are taking vocational classes at OSCI and eight are enrolled in a beauty school program.

\*\*The OWCC women are taking undergraduate studies at the Oregon State Penitentiary with courses accredited through Chemeketa Community College. The OSP contracted services is for Chemeketa Community College. In addition, one inmate attended upper division courses through Western Oregon State College.

TABLE 2  
AVERAGE MONTHLY ACADEMIC AND VOCATIONAL TRAINING COSTS

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Training</u>	<u>In-House</u>	<u>Contracted</u>
OSP	Academic	\$35,826 (11)	\$14,006 (22)
	Vocational	39,816 (13)	
OSCI	Academic	26,148 ( 9)	12,174 (23)
	Vocational	42,538 (16)	
OWCC	Academic	9,487 (2.5)	
	Vocational	4,828 (1.5)	
EOCI	Academic		*
	Vocational		

Costs for instruction provided by corrections staff is for salary and benefits for instructors, supervisor and clerical support. Data are based on budget data supplied by Ted Cave, Budget Manager. Accurate data on contracted costs for inmate instruction are not available from Blue Mountain Community College. Cost data from Chemeketa Community College were provided by Jean Marshall. Analyses of cost data were conducted by Tom Owens of NWREL. Figures in parentheses behind cost figures are the number of instructional staff, both full or part-time. Instructional costs include all staff salaries and fringe benefits, including support staff, but do not include facilities, equipment and supplies which would be needed in both in-house and contracted services.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE



TABLE 3  
COMPARISON OF AVERAGE MONTHLY INSTRUCTIONAL COSTS FOR ACADEMIC TRAINING  
PROVIDED INHOUSE VERSUS THROUGH CONTRACTED SERVICE

<u>OSP</u>	<u>In-House</u>	<u>Contracted</u>
Instructional Costs	\$35,826	\$14,006
Inmate Class Enrollments	437	516
Total Inmates Served	167	140
Average Cost per Class Enrollment	\$ 81.98	\$ 27.14
Average Cost per Inmate	\$214.52	\$ 100.04
<u>OSCI</u>		
Instructional Costs	\$26,148	\$ 12,174
Inmate Class Enrollments	549	402
Total Inmates Served	174	150
Average Cost per Class Enrollment	\$ 47.63	\$ 30.28
Average Cost per Inmate	\$150.28	\$ 81.16
<u>OWCC</u>		
Instructional Costs	\$ 9,487	*
Inmate Class Enrollments	62	27
Total Inmates Served	21	8
Average Cost per Class Enrollment	\$153.02	*
Average Cost per Inmate	\$451.76	*

-----  
\*Separate instructional costs were not computed since these eight women inmates were enrolled in 15 different courses taught at the Oregon State Penitentiary.

Average monthly instructional costs were based on salary and fringe benefits of instructional and support staff but excluded facilities, equipment and supplies needed by inmates under either delivery system. Contracted costs were significantly lower because of the large number of part-time instructors used in 1985-86. If full-time staff are used at the community colleges, the instructional costs can be expected to increase significantly in the coming year.

Eastern Oregon Correctional Institution (EOCI) has contracted with Blue Mountain Community College (BMCC) for inmate education and other services. In January 1986, there were 76 inmate enrollments in educational programs. Of that number at BMCC, 33 were in basic skills development and 20 in GED preparation. An additional 15 were enrolled in substance abuse classes sponsored by Mental Health. Inmates can receive college credit, however, for the substance abuse class through BMCC. The estimated full-time equivalent inmate enrollment is 36 FTE since some inmates can enroll in more than one course.

Preparing accurate costs for inmate instruction offered this year through BMCC is not possible according to Ellsworth Mayer, Associate Dean at BMCC, for several reasons. Services under the BMCC contract include things other than instruction. The initial estimated enrollments were based on EOCI's having 350 inmates rather than only 100, and the instruction this year involves a .75 FTE instructor plus part-time staff, whereas next year there will be greater use of full-time staff. Part-time staff are paid an average of \$11.00 an hour in the day and \$30.00 an hour in the evening. Given these variables, the only safe statement that can be made about instructional costs is that it ranges from \$1,100.00 to \$4,000.00 per FTE inmate.

In summary, the average cost per class enrollment and the average cost per inmate for academic training were both lower for contracted instruction than for inhouse instruction. One of the reasons for this is that the community colleges this year were using a number of part-time rather than full-time staff. However, for next year, they both plan to use more full-time instructors and thus the contracted costs will increase.

## GUIDING PRINCIPLES, ALTERNATIVES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### A. Principles

In addition to re-examining the recommendations made by study groups in 1974, 1977 and 1981, NWREL suggests that the Task Force consider the following guiding "principles" no matter what organizational pattern or delivery modes seem to fit present and future needs. These appear in no order of significance:

#### Define Mission

1. The goals for education and training in corrections need to be clearly defined within the overall mission of the Corrections Division. This becomes useful when examining the scope of offerings and assessing the issue of course overlap, duplication and articulation. NWREL believes it is wise to view the education and training function using the widest possible lens. While this study focused on institutions, we are aware that emergence of Community Corrections, for example, puts more of the "front end" potential for education and training services at the local level. This fact further underlines the need for a comprehensive strategy that involves offenders and education/training authorities from the initial sentencing stage all the way through release and parole stages.

Priorities for education and training services might be listed this way (from highest to lowest):

- a. Transition skills to employment (life "readiness" and survival skills)
- b. Avocational interests that motivate inmates to further their learning (computers, short-term interest classes)
- c. Adult basic education, including literacy training
- d. GED and high school completion
- e. Vocational/occupational training
- f. Support prison industries
- g. Associate of Arts degree offerings
- h. Baccalaureate degree offerings

Communicate these priorities widely to policymakers, corrections practitioners, and to the public at large.

#### Recognize Staff Concerns

2. Changes made in organizational patterns should protect existing personnel to the greatest extent possible. Benefits, salary levels, and seniority are examples of staff concerns that need to be addressed.

#### Protect Local Creativity

3. The superintendent's role and responsibility for education and training program leadership must be recognized at each institution. As the chief administrator of that institution, the superintendent is in a position to deal constructively with all facets of prison life and community relationships, and must make decisions daily that reflect the well-being

of inmates, staff, the surrounding community, other state agencies, and Oregon taxpayers. Independent judgements about program needs and delivery to reflect a particular institution's "culture" should be reserved.

#### Provide for Equity

4. The needs of women inmates deserve extra attention. While a few are interested in vocational/technical training, many more seem to be attracted to education and training that has a human resources development career focus supplemented by personal/social enhancement opportunities (self awareness, positive image-building, family/child care, interpersonal skill building). Also, other types of on-site vocational/technical training with OWCC might be considered such as: graphic arts, basic gasoline engine mechanics, ornamental horticulture, hotel and lodging services, or clothing manufacturing and production. Some escort costs and management costs at OWCC might be better directed to these kinds of programs. Itinerant teachers and mobile training units could serve OWCC.

#### Coordinate Training with Release Dates

5. Review the fact that there are waiting lists for many programs, particularly in the vocational-technical areas. Continue working to give "short-termers" the chance to receive training before "long-termers." Consider offering short-term training in cooperation with employers willing to help design the program and provide equipment/materials.

#### Orient Staff from Outside Systematically

6. Make sure that contract staff receive a full measure of training in prison security and culture. An orientation handbook at each institution would be useful.

#### Strengthen Transition Competencies

7. Pre-employment counseling and job search (employability) skills need to be reinstated at each institution--particularly if the Corrections Division Release Center is to change its focus. Resources such as the computer-based Career Information System (formerly available at some sites) are now available on micro-computer formats and could be a useful tool.

#### Market Programs Aggressively

8. Building on efforts such as the flyers used for vocational training at OSP, give greater attention to "marketing" education and training services. OSCI's plan to "plug in" to the institutional TV system is one good approach and others should be explored and backed up with budget support.

#### Develop Incentives for Participation

9. Learn from OSCI's effort to develop incentives for participation in education and training programs (Canteen privileges, shower privileges, etc.) and expand these incentives—including overt Parole Board recognition of competencies acquired as one factor in setting release dates.

#### Protect Learning Time

10. In light of the research on effective schools, protect the "time on task" which is required in classrooms and laboratories if effective learning is to occur. Interruptions should be minimized.

#### Refine Programs Based on Experience

11. Develop a follow-up system to gather at least minimal information on what happens when students leave the institution (continue a learning program? find employment? need additional skill training?).

#### Keep Everyone Informed

12. Resolve the needs contract teachers apparently have in obtaining equipment, supplies, materials. Set up regular meetings of contract personnel to maintain strong communication links.

#### Promote Inter-Institutional Staff Interactions

13. Reinstate regular meetings of all institutional staff and administrators to help everyone get the "big picture" and share ideas. Contract staff might also be included occasionally.

#### Recognize Built-In Differences

14. Deal with some of the obvious issues that occur when staff from several agencies work together: e.g., differences in salary levels for comparable work. Similarly, contract agency staff who work full time as opposed to those who are "part-timers" have similar concerns that need to be addressed.

#### Rotate Staff Occasionally

15. Rotate staff among institutions to alleviate burnout and encourage the sharing of ideas across sites.

#### Encourage Professional Renewal and Updating

16. Provide time off for instructional staff to pursue professional development opportunities. Develop a substitute teacher pool—perhaps utilizing retired corrections educators—to maintain classroom instruction.

### Review Testing Policies

17. Unless adult basic education standards are to be met by all inmates, consider not testing all inmates using the Metropolitan Achievement Test and only test those who are interested in education and training. The community college's own entrance exam should be used for those interested in academic/vocational programs.

### Review Vocational Offerings

18. Add some new vocational areas and eliminate others based in part on labor market trends and planning feedback from Employment Services placement specialists in addition to advisory committees.

### Advocate Corrections Education Staff Pre- and Inservice Training

19. Recognizing that working in a corrections-based education and training setting requires special preparation in dealing imaginatively with antisocial behavior patterns and other issues, collaborate with state education leaders (e.g., WOSC, Teacher Standards and Practices Commission) to develop unique professional development opportunities.

### B. Alternatives

1. The Corrections Division should clearly specify the education delivery service model which will work best for Oregon. Essentially, there are three distinct choices: institution-based as presently underway; statewide coordination as was available in times past; and creation of a corrections education district--a radical but promising new approach. The Oregon approach might incorporate attractive elements from more than one model.
2. Under whichever model is appropriate for corrections education in Oregon, ask the Legislature to appropriate funds specifically for education and training services in the corrections system. Include within that line item funding to support an administrator for corrections education and training housed in the Corrections Division or perhaps the State Department of Education, if all parties agree. In either case, funding for this position could be jointly shared by the Corrections and Education agencies to underscore the interagency ties inherent in the position. This person should have enough latitude to work with and among all agencies at the local and state level who have an education and training interest and/or a corrections responsibility. Other tasks should include (see Appendix):
  - a. Coordinating contractual arrangements between institutions and local community colleges
  - b. Keeping abreast of national and regional trends in corrections education
  - c. Serving as a resource on curriculum and instruction for institutional academic and vocational staff
  - d. Serve as a resource to local community colleges on the planning and delivery of corrections education/training services--including program articulation for inmates who return to their local communities
  - e. Serve as a clearinghouse and resource on securing external funding for corrections education and training services, including liaison with local JTPA jurisdictions

Another option to consider is incorporating within this position the planning and coordination of education/training within youth corrections. Articulation between these two systems is needed given the fact that a number of adult clients have been previously served in Oregon's juvenile system. Eventually, county community corrections programs should also be considered.

3. For the near term, continue the "mixed" form of service delivery now utilized and stipulate that college contract personnel be assigned to institutions as a long-term responsibility to the greatest extent possible. A further pre-requisite should be that contract staff understand fully they are responsible to institution administrators while on site and participate in as much of the institution's "life" as possible. Additional training on security procedures, dealing with



aberrant behavior, responding to inmate requests, safety concerns, understanding cultural differences and otherwise "absorbing" the subtleties of a prison culture is important and difficult to accomplish with part-time staff. There are naturally some concerns about part-time staff coming in and out of institutions who feel no real connection to the prison and/or extracurricular activities that might involve education/training staff as in any school situation.

4. An alternative deserving serious study under any organizational structure is to turn over all education and training functions at the institutions to the local community college. This would require staff transferring from state employment to community college employment and brings with it a host of procedural questions—including union concerns, pension transfer, seniority status, etc. States that have used this approach—most notably Washington—have found it works extremely well. The EOCI/Blue Mountain Community College connection is starting out positively. Conversion of programs from Corrections responsibility to community college responsibility can be done in such a way as to protect staff interests (e.g., "grandfather" clauses).

#### C. Recommendations

1. Begin immediately to identify a clear purpose statement for education and training, building on existing rules, and prior accomplishments as the starting point. This process should involve institutional and contract staff at the classroom level, institution program managers, superintendents/assistant superintendents, and Division-level administrators. Input from other state agencies should be considered.

Estimated cost: \$7,000

2. Within one year, fund a position that might be titled Assistant Administrator/Education and Training Programs who would sit at Policy Committee meetings with direct input (State Director of Corrections Education or State Coordinator of Corrections Education) and responsibility for planning and monitoring consistent services across institutions (see appendix for possible job description).

Estimated cost: \$75,000 per year (split cost with Department of Education and/or reassign existing staff to stay within the Division's present budget parameters)

3. Establish an interinstitutional curriculum committee to review two important questions: 1) What should be the common content for a "release readiness" curriculum which emphasizes job search and other employability skills? 2) How well do present vocational offerings stand up in light of projected labor market trends and should changes be made? Prior recommendations for competency-based approaches should be considered. Employer input and assistance from relevant state agencies should be sought.

Estimated costs: Staff planning time and travel

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

4. Begin discussions on contracting all education and training services to local community colleges as is presently under way at Eastern Oregon Corrections Institution. It may be determined that adult basic education services should be taught by institution personnel unless contract agreements specify that these instructors will be permanently assigned and specially prepared for their assignment. Superintendents should retain flexibility in program scheduling and offerings with assistance from the state-level administrator for education and training programs.

Estimated costs: Staff planning time and travel

5. Within one year, draft legislation and implementation policies/procedures for an Oregon corrections education district which would begin operations in 1988. It is likely that contracting with local community colleges would still be the preferred delivery mode. Conduct visits to Texas or Florida and to Virginia to observe how these districts operate.

Estimated costs: \$10,000 (consultants from states implementing this approach and assistance from Oregon legal experts)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## Appendix A

### CORRECTIONS EDUCATION COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

The Corrections Education Commission Report was issued in 1974. The statute which established the Joint Corrections Education Planning and Development Team also required the Team to consider the results of the Report. The Team has used the Report in its planning process and, in this section, responds to the recommendations contained in it.

#### The Corrections Education Commission, 1974

1. Recommended that Oregon's corrections education programs be centrally coordinated in three ways:

Inter-program coordination--Adult Basic Education, Vocational/Paraprofessional and Higher Education programs should be organized and scheduled in such a way as to allow for maximum utilization of all services by the individual. Concurrent enrollments should be encouraged.

Inter-institutional coordination--Coordinated, comprehensive educational programs should be offered equally to all incarcerated clients. Common rules and regulations regarding the delivery of education should be developed and implemented.

Inter-community coordination--All educational programs should be coordinated with comparable offerings in the community to facilitate interaction among staff and a smooth flow of clients to continued education and training upon release, parole, or discharge.

Ad hoc advisory committees should be established to assist in the continuing development and coordination of all programs. These

#### The Joint Planning and Development Team, 1977

The Team concurred with this recommendation, and reported implementation wherever possible.

The Team envisioned the curriculum committee as two concentric groups, with staff and Team members forming the primary working

#### Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1986

A number of inmates are concurrently enrolled in more than one program area (e.g., day and evening classes). This practice should be expanded.

Priority needs to be given to systematic coordination of education/training to assure quality and cost-effectiveness division-wide while respecting institutional independence and local resources. This can happen with statewide leadership.

Some staff take individual initiative with local community colleges. Inmate transfer to another post-secondary program on release is sporadic.

Education and training programs would benefit from a state-level policy or advisory group that can serve as an advocacy body as well as a quality control mechanism.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

committees should include representation from clients, staff, the educational community, and interested members of the general public.

A mechanism should also be established to complement this advisory committee effort that would allow for regular, periodic client and staff (internal) and third party (external) evaluation of program offerings.

2. Recommended that corrections education programs at all levels be so structured and organized as to allow for the rotation of staff between teaching assignments within the correctional facilities and comparable positions in outside education institutions.

With the implementation of such a rotation system, it further recommended that an affirmative action program be established to provide for an instructional staff that is reflective of the ethnic and cultural makeup of the prison population.

3. Recommended that no major new facilities construction be undertaken for education programs within the correctional institutions. Modification of existing facilities should accommodate educational needs of resident populations in 1974 and in the foreseeable future.

group, and with other resource persons forming the advisory "outer circle." The curriculum committee may choose to form subcommittees in each program area.

The Team supported this recommendation, and established such a mechanism. Third party evaluation is contingent on funding.

The Team did not find it feasible to implement this recommendation at the time, nor to reject it. Further study was necessary to see if this could be done within the existing staffing structure.

The Team concurred with this recommendation but feels that it should be implemented within the larger context of the Corrections Division's affirmative action program.

At the time of the Corrections Education Commission study, the institutional populations were approximately 60 percent of their current levels:

	1974	1976
OSP	860	1438
OSCI	456	730
OWCC	47	81
<u>Total</u>	1363	2249

Clearly, a near-doubling of the population was not foreseen by the authors of the study. The Team therefore recommended that educational facilities be supplemented to permit the delivery of quality services to all inmates.

The State Department of Education can provide assistance with program review. Creation of a separate Corrections Education District for the state would provide even more visibility.

NWREL interviews with staff found widespread interest in staff rotation, sharing of equipment, and collegial contacts with peers in "outside" education agencies.

While not a focus of this study, NWREL observed that strides have been made to provide a diversity of faculty, both state and community-college-based. Greater efforts could be made to recruit minority faculty.

Populations at Oregon's institutions have continued to grow since 1976, while turnover is increasing:

	February 1, 1986
OSP	1,705*
OSCI	1,002
OWCC	118
EOCI	99
<u>Total</u>	2,924

\*Not including annex, camp.

There are actually 4,837 offenders under institutional responsibility, considering released units, annex, camps and treatment programs. NWREL recommends a more detailed study of facility and program expansion in concert with the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

There exist excellent educational institutions throughout the state. The goal of inside educational activities should be placement of the individual in community education and training at the earliest possible time.

The Team concurred with the philosophy behind this recommendation. However, crowded conditions in the institutions resulted in the release of all inmates whose release is consistent with their own benefit and the good of society. The Team felt that the goal of community education does not preclude educational offerings for those inmates who remain within the institutions provided that those offerings are oriented toward the community. Liaison with community programs would be provided through Career Planning and Guidance Units.

With the press of meeting present demands, prisons and community college counseling staff still try to provide inmates with transition assistance so credits earned will transfer elsewhere. If local community colleges in "sending" communities were notified that a patron of their district were incarcerated, articulation might be encouraged.

4. Recommended the development of a centrally coordinated advising, counseling, career planning and placement program to provide services to inmates of all three correctional facilities, and to foster similar support and consideration within education institutions throughout the state for corrections clients studying in the community.

The Team agreed with this recommendation and recommended such a program.

NWREL found evidence that this recommendation was implemented. These functions could be provided by a central office.

5. Recommended that funding of corrections education programs should be awarded and administered in a manner consistent with and in amounts comparable to the funding now received by the state's community colleges.

The Team had not completed its recommendation for a funding mechanism prior to the publishing of this report.

Pell (federal financial aid) and FTE generated by Chemeketa and Blue Mountain Community Colleges are generating comparable resources. Effects of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings should be watched!

It was further recommended that those funds be administered to:  
(1) allow the corrections education programs to be eligible for state and federal education grants available only to certified education systems; and (2) allow the inmates to be eligible for student financial aid packages to help support their education.

Both of these recommendations were being implemented in 1977.

NWREL believes it may be wise to take steps to create a legal entity that serves as a unique education agency on par with other community colleges or institutions like the state schools for the blind and deaf.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

6. Recommended that responsibility for the planning and development of corrections education programs be vested with the Oregon Department of Education, the State System of Higher Education and the Corrections Division. Responsibility for operation of corrections education programs should be vested with the Corrections Division.

7. Recommended that Adult Basic Education services be provided residents of Oregon's correctional institutions through contract with one of the state's community colleges; and that this contract provide for the delivery of these services through the establishment of Study Skills Learning Centers to be staffed by instructors, with full college standing, and aides.

8. Recommended that Vocational/Paraprofessional Education services be provided residents of Oregon's correctional institutions through contracts drawn with four types of institutions: Apprenticeship Training Councils; Community Colleges; Industry; and proprietary schools.

It was further recommended that those education services be organized and presented in "career clusters" and that those contracted services be coordinated in such a way as to provide for awareness and exploration opportunities to complement the clustered skill development programs.

9. Recommended that Post-secondary Academic Education services be provided through a combination of contracted/volunteer instruction that uses the State System of Higher Education resources to the fullest extent possible.

This recommendation was implemented through SB 665 during the 1975 legislative session, with an auxiliary role played by the State System of Higher Education.

Learning Centers were in operation at all three institutions.

Some instruction was contracted. In the interest of those permanent employees who worked in corrections education, the Team recommended that only new services be contracted.

Some instruction was contracted. In the interest of those permanent employees who worked in corrections education, the Team recommended that only new services be contracted.

Awareness and exploration was incorporated into the career planning and guidance programs. The Team did not make any recommendations regarding the vocational training programs pending further study, but the clustering of these programs was one of the options being considered.

The Team concurred with this recommendation and took initial steps towards its implementation.

A corrections education district could bring together representatives from all ancillary agencies.

Adult Basic Education is primarily the responsibility of institutional educators, not the community college, in Salem sites. Blue Mountain Community College in Pendleton provides all educational services. A state coordinator could monitor programs statewide, both inhouse and contracted.

None of the vocational programs are presently contracted; however, credit is available for programs approved by Chemeketa. This arrangement is working well, despite some roadblocks. Coordination could help.

Curriculum in vocational programs does need to be reviewed in terms of transferable skills inmates need to consider. The Department of Education's 1985 review of its occupational clusters may provide some guidance.

This arrangement is working well with Western Oregon State College.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE



sities, and the Division of Continuing Education should be contracted with to provide some administrative as well as instructional services and should, as a part of that contract, share responsibility for the development of the curriculum and the extension of program linkages to both 2-year and 4-year postsecondary institutions throughout the state.

10. Recommended that the positive placement of the client in a community-based educational program be identified as the primary goal for corrections education activity. Inside educational offerings should be structured in such a way as to support the movement of the client toward continued education in a community setting at the earliest possible time.

11. Recommended the creation of a Criminal Justice Systems Education Consortium that would embrace and relate relevant offerings in postsecondary educational institutions including community colleges, and public and private four-year colleges and universities.

12. Recommended the development of a 3-year implementation program of community education to be seen as the preliminary step in the development of an ongoing community education program within the criminal justice field.

The Team concurred with this recommendation and began structuring program changes in this context.

The Team did not complete its plans on a comprehensive staff training program. A committee was working on identification of specific professional development needs for education staff members. This recommendation was considered in conjunction with the results of the committee's findings.

The Team deferred action in this area. It proposed, however, that subsequent activities in community education be undertaken in the larger context of the entire criminal justice system rather than in the relatively narrow field of corrections education.

Community college counselors and corrections educators in Oregon try to facilitate the transition of offenders to a program back home, but little is known about what happens once the inmate leaves the institution. Parole officers are not apparently involved because of large case loads.

The Corrections Division Training Department provides some assistance here, but there is still no coordinated approach to staff development--particularly since staff are based in different agencies.

MREL did not examine this issue.



OREGON CORRECTION EDUCATION PLANNING  
AND DEVELOPMENT TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS, 1984

The 1974 Corrections Education Commission recommended the establishment of a Joint Corrections Education Planning and Development Team representing a variety of agencies.

The team's first annual report, prepared in 1977, focused on coordinated program planning and gave the development of a comprehensive delivery system a second priority--"to provide for each client the opportunity to develop to the best of his/her ability the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to function successfully as a producer, learner, individual, consumer, citizen, and family member. The Team recommended:

A career planning and guidance capability

1. systematic assessment process and periodic measures of goal achievement for each client.
2. Client access to counseling services to enhance ability to perform as a responsible individual in life roles.
3. Access to appropriate career information to facilitate client's career choice.
4. Client participation in planning an educational program to achieve personal goals.

A competency-based curriculum

1. Coordination of all education program offerings to develop a competency-based curriculum emphasizing those competencies necessary for coping with the demands of society.
2. Curriculum will emphasize the competencies in the six life roles.

Access to appropriate training opportunities

1. Vocational training available to inmates whose career goals correspond to existing programs.
2. Augment the space available to expand access to educational programs.
3. Access to well-planned postsecondary programs emphasizing A.A. degrees and relating to community education programs for eligible inmates.

Adequate staff support systems

1. Coordinated staff development program.
2. Functions of all education staff clearly delineated.
3. Educational program offerings will be enriched by utilization of the volunteer.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Coordination planning based on systematic evaluation.

1. All substantive education program changes will be routed through the Team.
2. Each program component will be evaluated according to its stated objectives.
3. Independent, third-party evaluation performed to determine effectiveness of program, including cost-effectiveness.
4. Follow-up information on clients receiving education services will be used in planning process.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## APPENDIX B

### ANALYSIS OF EMPLOYMENT-RELATED EDUCATION AND TRAINING IN OREGON CORRECTIONS, 1981

In May 1981, the State Employment and Training Council (SETC) commissioned the Executive Department to conduct an inventory and assessment of employment and training services provided by selected state agencies. The purpose of this effort was to be an initial step toward fulfilling the Commission's statutory mandate to "Review plans of state agencies providing employment, training and related services. Provide comments and recommendations to the Governor, appropriate state agencies, prime sponsors, the general public and the appropriate federal agencies on the relevancy and effectiveness of employment, training and related service delivery systems in the state and on means of improving effectiveness." This initial effort reviewed 13 programs in seven state agencies, including the Corrections Division. Findings are included in a report titled Doing More with Less in Employment-Related Education and Training in Oregon, December 1981. Only comments relating to corrections institutions are included here:

#### OREGON STATE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION

Comments by the study team relating to this program indicate concern for the high turnover rates of participants in the program. The study team notes that much of this turnover results from causes beyond the control of the staff providing vocational training. Included in these disruptive influences are: parole, inmate discipline, correction, and rehabilitation. Concern was also expressed at the lack of coordination between programs at OSCI and other institutions within the Corrections Division. Another impediment to successful vocational education and training is identified as the lack of basic educational skills by many inmates.

The study recommended that short courses be developed in vocational training to respond to the unique circumstances encountered in a correctional institution. The team also recommended development of a methodology which could be used to rate the quality of training achieved by participants.

In addition to the study team recommendations, the following suggestions appear worthy of consideration:

- o Develop modular training programs, the content and sequence of which closely parallel training programs available outside of correctional institutions.
- o Initiate a program which would make continuation of vocational education programs in progress during incarceration a condition of parole.

- o Establish admission standards for vocational training in terms of basic educational competency of inmates being considered for vocational education.
- o Where inmate basic skills do not demonstrate a level of reading, writing and computational abilities which will permit successful completion of vocational programs, divert applicants to compensatory educational programs which will provide the necessary skills to allow achievement in vocational education programs at a later date.

It should be noted that apprenticeship training programs within OSCI appear to be among the most successful of the vocational programs. Although the study discusses vocational education programs and apprenticeship programs as a single subject, emphasis should be placed upon apprenticeship activities wherever appropriate because of the past success of these programs.

#### OREGON STATE PENITENTIARY

Comments by the study team reflect a situation at the Oregon State Penitentiary (OSP) similar to that described at OSCI. Concern is expressed at the low program completion rate, which is only 29 percent at the Penitentiary.

As in the case of OSCI, much of the disruption is based on influences beyond the control of vocational education personnel. Again, the apprenticeship program was acknowledged as having a well-coordinated effort. Study team comments identify some duplication in the area of inmate job search training. Although not expressed as a specific recommendation, study comments indicate the need to limit job search training to the Corrections Division Release Center (CDRC) or the immediate predischage activity of the inmate.

Further comment stresses the importance of getting feedback and followup information from former inmates after they leave the correctional system. Once again, the concept of using program participants' social security numbers to identify those who achieved employment related to training received is mentioned.

Study team recommendations include a proposal to increase the degree of coordination of employment and training services within all institutions of the Corrections Division; use of Oregon's Occupational Program Planning System (OPPS) as a means of participant followup to evaluate success of training programs; and increased efforts to develop greater business and industry awareness of the OSP vocational training program.

- o Use OPPS to fulfill the need for an effective, economical, and readily-available means to evaluate the effectiveness of vocational training programs.

This project is urged as a high priority.

- o Eliminate job search training redundancy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## Prison Industries

Comments relating to this program closely parallel those relating to other Corrections Division programs. A significant departure from prior Corrections vocational efforts is mentioned as an impediment to this program. This is the problem created when Prison Industries attempts to train inmates for jobs which exist in private industry; the inevitable result is the production of products which compete in the open market with private industry.

The dilemma presented here is that if training programs are limited to noncompetitive activities, the "graduate" trainees become accomplished at vocations which either do not exist on the "outside" or which exist in such limited numbers that prospects for productive unsubsidized employment are very poor.

Recommendations proposed by the study team for this program are remarkably similar to those previously discussed. They are:

- o Increased coordination of employment and training programs in all institutions of the Corrections Division.
- o A restatement of the recommendation to utilize the Oregon Employment Division computer files to permit followup of the program success in terms of former inmates who have achieved employment in the area in which training was received.
- o A recommendation to develop greater business and industry awareness of the Oregon State Penitentiary vocational training program using existing advisory committees or trade advisory committees currently being developed.
- o Diversify the goods and services produced by the Prison Industries so that training received in this program will result in employable skills when the inmate is discharged.

## RELEASE SERVICES AND FIELD SERVICES

The study team comments relating to the Job Placement program largely corroborate the information developed in the individual programs of the Corrections Division.

Concern is indicated that the length of time taken for an inmate to find a job and the type of job secured are not monitored and, therefore, could not be evaluated.

Further commentary confirms earlier concerns that some of the training received by inmates while incarcerated generates skills which are not transferrable to the labor market outside the institutions.

Other comments reiterate concerns expressed relating the repetitive training given in some programs in job search skills.

The study team recommendations again urge followup of former inmate employment experiences so that training may be better evaluated and improved.

The recommendation is also made that the Corrections Division take action to increase coordination between the vocational training activities and the job placement staff to improve the potential for productive unsubsidized employment based on training received by the inmate while incarcerated.

- o Initiate a program to identify the length of time taken for inmates to find a job, the type of job secured, and how long held.
- o Evaluate, in terms of employment, the most effective vocational training programs within the Corrections Division and use this information to utilize available resources for the most successful programs.

## APPENDIX C

### COLLEGES WITH FENCES REPORT, 1985

In its yet-to-be-published report, Colleges with Fences: A Handbook for Correctional Education Program Improvement, The National Center for Research in Vocational Education summarized the following strategies. After each item, NWREL's observations of Oregon's institutions appear.

#### STRATEGIES RELATED TO THE CONTEXT OF POSTSECONDARY CORRECTIONAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

1. Correctional educators should actively participate in national organizations that will serve as special interest lobbyists for correctional education programs and issues.
2. Form a statewide consortium of postsecondary institutions that provide academic and vocational programs for the state department of corrections.
3. Postsecondary correctional educators should attempt to establish a cooperative relationship with the local community.
4. A team approach between postsecondary and correctional institution staff should be established.

#### STRATEGIES RELATED TO THE DELIVERY OF POSTSECONDARY CORRECTIONAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

5. Select admissions policies so that only those inmates who are highly motivated and who have the prerequisite skills and knowledge are enrolled in postsecondary vocational education programs.
6. Encourage participation in postsecondary vocational programs by providing course, program, and tuition payment information to all inmates.
7. Provide financial incentives for education that are similar to those given to inmates who work in correctional prison industry and other institutional job assignments.
8. Establish an inmate assessment team staffed by educational and correctional personnel to create a comprehensive educational plan for each inmate who participates in the postsecondary vocational education program.
9. Integrate and coordinate the activities of the postsecondary vocational education programs and prison industries.
10. Develop services that support inmates' integration into society.
11. Use national and statewide labor market information whenever possible in the vocational program selection and planning process.



12. Form a vocational education advisory committee to direct the planning and implementation of new postsecondary vocational education programs.
13. Eliminate any indication on postsecondary degrees, awards, and certificates that the inmates' educational attainment was achieved through a correctional education program.
14. Ensure that the postsecondary correctional vocational programs adhere to accrediting standards and procedures used by free-world educational institutions in order to ensure program equivalence.
15. Encourage correctional education staff to provide special mini-courses in subject areas that they and/or the inmates find mutually beneficial.
16. Individualize postsecondary vocational instruction to the extent necessary to accommodate the learning needs of inmate-learners.
17. Implement competency-based or performance-based instructional modules wherever appropriate and feasible.
18. Implement time-on-task procedures to increase the productivity of educators' and inmate-learners' instructional time.
19. Utilize positive rather than negative reinforcements to reward inmate-learner performance when appropriate.
20. Ensure that the postsecondary vocational education faculty is composed of both correctional staff and educators from an external educational institution.
21. Provide all new educational staff with some form of orientation and training in correctional procedures and correctional education philosophy.
22. Provide educational staff with opportunities to upgrade their skills and knowledge as educators.

STRATEGIES RELATED TO THE EVALUATION OF  
POSTSECONDARY CORRECTIONAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

23. Identify, for each vocational education program, an appropriate set of criteria to measure program success accurately.
24. Create evaluative instruments to assess the performance of correctional educators.
25. Conduct evaluations of inmate-learners based on their performance, retained knowledge, and attained skill levels.
26. Conduct post-release evaluation of former inmate-learners based on employment status, need for social service assistance, and rate of recidivism.

## APPENDIX D

### CHARACTERISTICS OF EXEMPLARY CORRECTIONS EDUCATION PROGRAMS, 1984

In 1984, the Corrections Education Association (CEA) Resolutions Committee presented a list of characteristics found in exemplary correction education delivery systems. These should be considered as part of Oregon's delivery system.

- A. The CEA encourages states to apply the equal educational opportunity principle to persons in contact with the criminal justice system.
  - 1. Educational opportunities for the incarcerated should be comparable to those available in the free community.
  - 2. Congress and many state legislatures established educational programs to which each citizen is entitled--basic educational opportunities for everyone, including the disadvantaged, neglected/delinquent, illiterate, adult, handicapped, and unskilled.
- B. The CEA will encourage state and local jurisdictions to decide which agency is responsible for delivering educational services to persons in contact with the criminal justice system (i.e., which state agency, and which local agency).
- C. The CEA will advocate the establishment or continuation of jurisdiction-wide CE delivery systems capable of:
  - 1. Assessing the educational needs of offenders at intake, as part of the classification process.
  - 2. Providing vocational, academic, and social education programs relevant to the identified needs of incarcerated individuals.
  - 3. Providing jurisdiction-wide supervisory support in the areas of CE curriculum, staff development, and program implementation/evaluation.
  - 4. Accessing state, federal, and local education funds and support services.
  - 5. Hiring instructors who are certified by the state department of education.
  - 6. Working with the state department of education to establish formal CE certification standards, and with the higher education community to establish CE teacher training programs.
  - 7. Acquiring program accreditation from a recognized accrediting agency.
  - 8. Credentialing program graduates with certificates, diplomas, or licenses.

9. Transferring student credit to non-CE educational programs in the free community.
10. Ensuring that CE administrative decisions (in curricular, personnel, fiscal, and internal policy matters) are made by professional correctional educators assigned to CE decision-making positions.
11. Maintaining formal links and formal liaisons with related service delivery and funding agencies.
12. Developing public visibility through relevant programming, community involvement, and accessible information.
13. Utilizing the services of an independent advisory or policy board.
14. Maximizing educational opportunities at correctional institutions, court schools, pretrial detention centers, etc., within the jurisdiction.

(Journal of Correctional Education, vol. 35, issue 4, pps. 138-139, December 1984.

## APPENDIX E

### FLORIDA'S CORRECTIONS EDUCATION DISTRICT MODEL

The Board of Correctional Education is attached to the Department of Corrections and appointed by the Governor, which shall be composed of seven voting members and two nonvoting ex officio members. Voting members shall include: one member from the Department of Corrections recommended by the Secretary of Corrections, one member from the Department of Education recommended by the Commissioner of Education, and five members from the community at large jointly recommended by the Secretary of Corrections and the Commissioner of Education. Members at large shall have knowledge of correctional education, education, or corrections issues. Nonvoting ex officio members shall be the chairman of the Parole and Probation Commission and a representative from Prison Industries. The Governor may remove any member for cause and shall fill vacancies, as appropriate, with persons recommended as provided herein.

Members of the board shall serve without compensation but shall be reimbursed for per diem and travel expenses incurred in the performance of their duties.

Members shall be appointed for terms of four years each, except for initial appointments and whenever a vacancy occurs other than by expiration of a term. Initial terms shall be as follows: the Department of Corrections and Department of Education representatives and two members at large shall be appointed for 2-year terms and three members at large shall be appointed for 4-year terms. Whenever a vacancy occurs other than by expiration, the Governor shall appoint a member for the remainder of that term.

No appointed member shall serve more than two consecutive 4-year terms.

Members of the board shall elect a chairman annually.

The responsibilities of the board shall be to:

1. Adopt and enforce all necessary rules for the management and operation of education programs within the Department of Corrections, except that the rules adopted hereunder shall not conflict with rules of the Department of Corrections or with institutional operating procedures.
2. Independently monitor and assess all inmate education program services and report the results of such evaluation in the board's annual report of its activities.
3. Set the compensation and salary of the Director of Correctional Education.
4. Adopt rules governing the compensation and salary of teachers and other education personnel under annual or term contracts.
5. Visit and inspect schools at reasonably frequent intervals.

6. Approve education programs of the appropriate levels and types in the correctional institutions and adopt rules for the admission of inmate students thereto.
7. Enter into agreements with public or private school districts, entities, community colleges, junior colleges, colleges, or universities as may be deemed appropriate for the purpose of carrying out its duties and responsibilities.
8. Review and approve the budget request for the correctional education program.
9. Review and approve the 5-year comprehensive plan for correctional education.
10. Review and approve goals and objectives relating to all phases of the correctional education program.
11. Report the board's annual activities to the Secretary of Corrections, the Commissioner of Education, the Governor, and the Legislature.

#### Role of the Director

There is hereby established a Director of Correctional Education who shall be appointed by the Board of Correctional Education and shall serve at the discretion of the board. The director shall:

Develop standardized correctional education curricula which shall be in accordance with Department of Education standards.

Ensure that correctional education programs provide minimum performance standards, basic functional literacy skills, and marketable vocational skills which are in accordance with established Department of Education standards.

Develop a mechanism to evaluate the effectiveness of correctional education programs, to include criteria similar to those utilized by the Department of Education.

In concurrence with the institutional superintendent, recommend the institution educational program manager to the board for appointment. After consultation with the institution educational program manager and the institutional superintendent, approve all staff responsible for providing educational programs.

Ensure that all education staff shall be certified in accordance with the Department of Education standards. Provision shall be made for the development of individual plans, approved by the Director of Correctional Education, in the event any current education staff member does not qualify for certification and the school authority chooses to hire him.

Give priority consideration to adversely affected employees who were displaced when the Department of Corrections lost the use of written agreement positions for hiring new staff.

Develop a compensation and pay plan for correctional educators which is competitive with school district salaries and includes a step pay plan.

Develop a procedure for maintaining a list of substitute teachers so that students will not be temporarily displaced in the event a regular instructor is absent for any reason. Institution educational program managers shall maintain an active substitute list at all times.

Develop a mechanism to test all offenders committed to the Department of Corrections which test is in accordance with acceptable Department of Education testing standards.

Develop a 5-year comprehensive plan for correctional education by June 1, 1987. The plan shall have a 3-year phase-in schedule and shall require the director to:

1. Provide for mandatory academic education programs for all youthful offenders with 5-year sentences or less, who test below a 6.0 literacy level.
2. Provide for special incentives for participation, as well as include appropriate disciplinary measures for eligible inmates who refuse to participate.
3. Develop measurable objectives.
4. Develop quality control mechanisms.
5. Interface academic education and vocational training with participation in prison industries programs.
  - a. Develop goals and objectives relating to all phases of the correctional education program.
  - b. Funds appropriated for education shall be used solely for that purpose and shall not be transferred to any other budget entity.
  - c. Prepare the budget request for the entire correctional education program and submit it to the Board of Correctional Education. The director shall be responsible for all expenditures pursuant to appropriations.
  - d. Immediately implement procedures to secure appropriate entitlement funds from federal and state grant sources to supplement the annual appropriation. These funds shall be utilized expressly for correctional education.
  - e. Be responsible, along with the Board of Correctional Education, for all academic education and vocational training programs.



- f. Specify which educational facilities shall offer vocational training and which programs shall be available. Criteria for making such determinations shall be in accordance with accepted Department of Education standards. Programs not meeting minimum Department of Education standards shall not be offered.
- g. Ensure that correctional education programs comply with public policies and goals and objectives of the state which include, but shall not be limited to:
  - 1. The goal of the correctional education program to provide every inmate who has an expectation of release from custody within five years with the opportunity to achieve functional literacy, specifically the ability to read and write the English language and the ability to perform routine mathematical functions prior to his release or expiration of his sentence.
  - 2. The goal of the correctional education program to provide every inmate who has an expectation of release from custody within five years, and who has demonstrated the intellectual capacity to benefit therefrom, with the opportunity to obtain the equivalent of a public high school education. The highest priority in achieving this goal shall be focused on those institutions housing youthful offenders as defined in chapter 958.
  - 3. The goal of the correctional education program to ensure that every inmate be released possessing general educational skills which are fundamental to career and personal development and necessary for participation in a democratic society, including skills, attitudes, and knowledge for general problem solving and survival; human relations and citizenship; moral and ethical conduct; mental and physical health; aesthetic, scientific, and cultural appreciation; and environmental and economic understanding.
  - 4. The goal of the correctional education program to ensure that every inmate who has an expectation of release from custody within five years be released possessing at least entry-level marketable vocational skills in one or more occupational fields for which there is a demonstratable demand in the economy of this state.
  - 5. The policy of the state that inmates who demonstrate college-level aptitudes be provided the opportunity to participate in two year college-level academic programs which may be offered within correctional facilities. Some associated costs shall be borne by the inmate.



6. The policy of the state that training in the fundamentals of physical education and personal health be an integral part of all academic and vocational education programs. Such training shall include instruction in personal hygiene, general health, the importance of rules and discipline in athletic contests, and regular vigorous physical exercise and shall be emphasized in those correctional facilities housing youthful offenders.
- h. In conjunction with local corrections superintendents, determine "extreme emergency" conditions. Department of Corrections institutional managers are prohibited from taking inmates out of the classroom unless such an extreme emergency condition occurs.

Section 2. The Board of Correctional Education shall retain the current core education structure within institutions offering education services to inmates with the expansion of staff under such structure to include attendance clerks. All employees of the Department of Corrections assigned to perform any inmate education services shall be given priority consideration for hiring by the Director of Correctional Education.

## APPENDIX F

### POSSIBLE POSITION DESCRIPTION:

#### Assistant Administrator/Education and Training Programs Oregon Corrections Division

Administers the Division's Education System which provides education and training services for inmates at each of the Division's institutions.

Develop, implement and maintain systems for the delivery of all levels of education and training to inmates of Corrections Division institutions; represent the Corrections Division Administrator on matters relating to corrections education and training (e.g., Oregon Department of Education, Oregon State System of Higher Education, Oregon State Job Training Council, U.S. Department of Education, Correctional Education Association, Confederation of Oregon School Administrators, Teacher Standards and Practices Commission.); act as the Corrections Division's education authority.

Establish and maintain an organizational structure for centralized program administration that provides (1) decisionmaking authority, direction and supervision of education practice by a qualified educator; (2) coordinated management of education and training programs compatible with the operation of each Corrections Division institution.

Prepare, or cause to be prepared, administrative rule(s) and policy for Corrections Division that relate to inmate academic and vocational development consistent with statute, regulatory, accrediting or professional practice standards; direct the implementation of Corrections Division rules and policy into procedural statements at the program level; review, or cause to be reviewed, annually all rules, policy and procedures relating to the education program.

Manage fiscal resources allocated for education services; establish a fiscal reporting structure which provides information necessary to develop budget requests and documents current expenditures by category of service monitored; evaluate cost-effectiveness of current delivery methods and implement cost-saving alternatives.

Establish and maintain systems which provide management information and evaluate quality of education services including statistics on volume of various services offered by the institutions and/or under contract.

Establish biennial plan for the education program; evaluate annually productivity of the education program, according to the goals and objectives that were accomplished; use the results of the evaluation to develop subsequent plans and communicate results of the evaluation.

Serve as a member of the Division's Policy Committee.

Coordinate the focus of education delivery service with education managers including participation at Institution Operations Committee; meeting with institution superintendents/release service Parole Board to share information, resolve conflicts and problem solve; identify and provide centralized services responsive to institution operations and the priorities of institution education and training managers.

Establish an annual plan for inservice education and training of education personnel in the development of the Corrections Division training plan; obtain, coordinate or provide inservice education or training for education personnel; serve as a resource to the Corrections Division training unit.

Assist with the development of recreational, educational, and law library collections and services in the Department. Monitor library procedures and make recommendations to the director, or the state librarian for improvement. Seek additional donations to support DOC program needs.

Serve as a program consultant for the Division of STET Industries.

Serve as administrator for the ECIA Chapter I, and all handicapped programs for the Division.

Pursue additional funding sources such as the Women's Education Equity Program Act and Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA).

## APPENDIX G

### INTERVIEWS WITH INMATES, 1986

Using a format suggested by NWREL, personal interviews were completed by staff at Chemekata Community College and Blue Mountain Community College of 39 inmates across the four corrections institutions. Questions included how long the inmate had been at the institution; knowledge of training opportunities; courses taken, if any; reasons for not participating; likes and dislikes about any classes taken; types of training that should be added or expanded; and suggestions for improving training.

Inmates in the sample had been at the institution from several months to nine years. Some mentioned having also been there before. About two-thirds of those interviewed were able to name specific courses offered, while others mentioned academic and vocational as general areas. No one was completely unaware of training opportunities.

All but four of those interviewed had participated in some form of training. Of the remaining four, one was working in the kitchen at that time, one was on a waiting list for cosmetology, one had not been at the institution long enough to start, and the other was anticipating release.

For those who had taken classes, most had favorable comments to share. The most frequent reply was in praise of the instructors (by 7 inmates) and specific comments about their willingness to take time to help students (5 inmates). Other favorable comments given by more than one inmate were interesting selections to choose from (3 inmates), the chance to work at one's own pace (2) and the opportunity to satisfy a thirst for knowledge (2).

Although 22 individual areas were identified as concerns, only four were given by more than one inmate. These areas were: not enough computers (2 inmates), outdated vocational training (2), old equipment (2) and lack of variety in instruction (2).

Areas of training that at least two or more inmates thought should be added or expanded were: a more complete computer technology program (4 inmates), readjustment or living skills (4), graphic arts/printing (3), a structured business program (3), art (2), and electronics (2).

Suggestions for improving training offered by two or more inmates were, the need for more teachers (3 inmates), more hands-on learning (3), expanded desks in cells (3), more "one-to-one" learning (2), and more teacher aides (2).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## APPENDIX H

### OREGON LABOR MARKET PROJECTIONS

Working with the Oregon Occupational Information Coordinating Committee, NWREL analyzed the vocational training areas offered at OSCI and at OSP in light of state labor market projections for employment in these areas. Table 1 shows the data for OSCI and Table 2 for OSP.

Of the 15 vocational areas offered at OSCI three seem particularly relevant for future employment--1) air conditioning and refrigeration, 2) electrical and 3) building maintenance. On the other hand, three vocational areas are low in terms of future employment opportunities--barbering, welding and meat cutting. In barbering, the employment projections for 1991 are actually lower than in 1986. Vocational training staff and inmates probably already know that two areas being taught have a current unemployment rate of over 25 percent--carpentry (28 percent) and welding (35 percent).

Of the eight vocational areas offered at OSP, all seem relevant to the future job market except barbering and welding.

Based on occupational areas with high projected demand in Oregon, future areas for vocational training that might be considered include food industry occupations, word processing, and retail sales.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OREGON LABOR MARKET PROJECTIONS FOR VOCATIONAL  
TRAINING AREAS OFFERED AT OSCI

<u>Vocational Area</u>	<u>1986 Employment</u>	<u>1986 Openings</u>	<u>1984 Unemployment</u>	<u>Unemployment Rate</u>	<u>1991 Employment</u>	<u>Annual Growth 1986-91</u>
Air Conditioning and Refrigeration	794	67	99	12	940	3.68
Auto Body Repair and Refinishing	1,216	55	290	20	1,332	1.91
Auto Repair	8,362	382	1,410	15	9,121	1.82
Baking	1,278	69	198	14	1,364	1.05
Barbering	143	7	17	11	141	-.28
Building Maintenance	7,447	283	787	10	8,145	1.87
Building Trades/Carpentry	781	102	281	28	886	2.69
Building Trades/Electrical	3,993	212	857	19	4,651	3.30
Cooking	5,474	356	1,662	24	6,059	2.14
Drafting	2,807	135	538	17	3,279	3.36
Electronic Servicing (Mechanic)	381	20	248	40	419	1.99
Landscaping (Garden)	3,887	351	847	19	4,351	2.39
Meat Cutting	174	8	47	22	182	.92
Printing (Press and Offset)	1,945	66	135	6	2,094	1.50
Small Engine Repair	1,165	62	129	10	1,298	2.28
Welding	4,804	325	2,366	15	5,811	.03

**OREGON LABOR MARKET PROJECTIONS FOR VOCATIONAL  
TRAINING AREAS OFFERED AT OSP**

<u>Vocational Area</u>	<u>1986 Employment</u>	<u>1986 Openings</u>	<u>1984 Unemployment</u>	<u>Unemployment Rate</u>	<u>1991 Employment</u>	<u>Annual Growth 1986-91</u>
Automotive/Diesel	8,362	382	1,410	15	9,121	1.82
Barber/Hair Design	143	7	17	11	141	- .28
Body and Fender Repair	1,216	55	290	20	1,332	1.91
Building Maintenance	7,447	283	787	10	8,145	1.87
Cabinetmaking/Carpentry	781	102	281	28	886	2.69
Electronics (Assembler)	4,442	297	923	19	5,387	4.25
Small Engine Repair	1,165	62	129	10	1,298	2.28
Welding	4,304	325	2,366	35	5,811	.03

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Source: Oregon OPPS Analysis File, 1986. The projected annual growth index is computed by subtracting the 1986 employment figures from the 1991 employment figure. The result is divided by the 1986 figure and the sum is divided by 5, then multiplied by 100.



VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS AVAILABLE  
IN OREGON'S ADULT CORRECTIONS INSTITUTIONS

<u>Program</u>	<u>OSCI</u>	<u>OSP</u>	<u>OWCC</u>
Air Conditioning	X		
Auto Body and Fender	X	X	
Automobile Repair (mechanics)	X	X	
Baking	X		
Barbering/Hair Design	X	X	
Building Maintenance Svcs.	X	X	
Business Education			X
Carpentry/Cabinetmaking	X	X	
Cosmetology			X
Electrical	X		
Electronics	X	X	
Landscaping	X		
Meatcutting	X		
Printing	X		
Small Engine Repair	X	X	
Welding	X	X	

Not included here are dozens of apprenticeship opportunities available through other prison program units (e.g., Food Services Departments, Prison Industries).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Doing More with Less in Employment-Related Education and Training in Oregon Report, December 1981.

Gehring, Thom G. "A Comparative Study of Instructional Quality in Correctional School Districts, and Correctional Education Systems Without School District Structure." Ph.D. Draft Dissertation Prospectus. Virginia Commonwealth University, 1986.

Joint Corrections Education Planning and Development Team Report, 1977.

Journal of Correctional Education, "CEA Approves Resolutions," pps. 137-141. vol. 35, issue 4, December 1984.

Littlefield, Jack, et al. Executive Summary, Colleges with Fences: A Handbook for Correctional Education Program Improvement, The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1985.

Oregon Corrections Education Commission Report, 1974.

Salmomy, Lawrence D., Corrections Education in Oregon: A Way to Proceed. A Report to the State Corrections Education Commission, June 1974.